



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3268182

52 Daines Way, Thorpe Bay, Essex, SS1 3PQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Dallon against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01817/FULH, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey rear and side extensions, first floor extension over existing porch, extended loft room and rear roof, cat slide roof side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area;
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 54 Daines Way in terms of whether the development is overbearing and results in a sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The development plan includes policies KP2 and CP4 in the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) and policies DM1 and DM3 in the Council's Development Management Document (2015). Those policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that proposals improve the urban environment through quality design, secure a good relationship with existing development and have regard to the Council's Design and Townscape Guide SPD, respect the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its architectural approach, size and form and adopt a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and the surrounding area.
4. The appeal site lies within a residential area of mainly two storey detached dwellings built in the inter-war period to individual designs in a mock 'Tudor' style, mostly with hipped main roofs and sometimes with subservient projecting gables. Whilst many have been extended and altered, the more successful examples are those which respect the scale of the dwelling. In general second floor accommodation is provided within the main roof with

dormer windows or rooflights. As such, the dwellings are perceived as two storeys and the predominantly hipped roof forms are retained, providing generous gaps between dwellings at first floor level and contributing to the area's attractive, spacious character. Materials are varied with timber half-boarding present on part of some front elevations of dwellings in Daines Way.

5. Although it has been extended previously, the appeal dwelling retains much of its mock Tudor character, in its main hipped roof, leaded light windows and wide hipped roof porch. These elements contribute positively to the consistency of its attractive appearance. Although second floor accommodation is provided within the roof, the front dormer is very much a subsidiary element.
6. The Council considers that the proposed rear extension and rear dormer are acceptable and on the basis of the plans and what I saw at my visit, I would agree.
7. Its objections relate to the size, scale, bulk and detail of the front and side extensions. The front extension to the first and second floor levels includes a gabled roof at second floor level which would extend across the full width of the main part of the house with a ridge above that of the hipped roof, two storey side extension. The height and width of the gable would result in this element dominating the front elevation excessively despite the inclusion of a smaller front extension over the existing porch. As such, the main hipped roof would no longer be the dominant feature. Unlike most of the projecting gables seen on other dwellings in the area, it would not be subservient to the main part of the dwelling and the siting of a window in the gable would emphasise its disproportionate scale. I have noted that the neighbouring house at no 54 has a wider projecting gable across the full width of the dwelling but that has a chalet-style roof with a lower ridge and much lower eaves height, thus maintaining its mock Tudor characteristics. The proposed gable in this case would make the dwelling appear top-heavy and, as a three storey dwelling, it would be uncharacteristic of the area.
8. The two storey side extension would have a dual hipped roof separated by a lead valley gutter. I have noted that a similar side extension was approved at 58 Daines Way in 2020 but that proposal did not include other extensions as in this case. Whilst I have also noted that it would be set back slightly at first floor level, it would be clearly seen from the street and would result in a complex roofscape which would significantly increase the bulk of the roof at first floor level and would appear awkward and overly prominent in the street scene, detracting from the main hipped roof.
9. The catslide roof dormer on the other side of the roof is not an inappropriate feature in itself. It would reflect the character of the dwelling better than a hipped roof dormer and similar catslide roof examples can be seen in other dwellings in the area. However, in this case it would accentuate the bulk of the proposal further and would add a further element to this complicated design of three different sized gables and extensive use and differing proportions of timber half boarding. The result of so many disparate elements, together with the disproportionate size, scale and form of the proposal, would be visually jarring and would not reflect the consistency of the existing dwelling. I have noted that permission was granted in 1997 for a side dormer as part of a previous loft conversion but not implemented. The details of that are unclear to

me but even if that consent is extant, it does not outweigh my findings because it could not be implemented with this proposal.

10. The appellant has referred to a number of examples of extensions or new dwellings in the area. I disagree that those are comparable. Nos 14 and 16 Daines Way, the dwelling opposite the appeal site and 23 Burlescoombe Road all have a main hipped roof and *subservient* projections, reflecting a mock Tudor style.
11. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed front and side extensions, by reason of their size, scale, bulk and detail, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. As such, they fail to accord with the development plan policies referred to above.

Living conditions

12. Policies KP2 and CP4 and policies DM1 and DM3, as referred to earlier, also seek to ensure that proposals protect the amenity of immediate neighbours and do not lead to over-intensification, through quality design, a good relationship with existing development and regard to the Council's Design and Townscape Guide SPD.
13. The neighbouring dwelling to the north, no 54, is a detached two storey dwelling (with a dormer on the side elevation furthest from the proposal). Its nearest side elevation, excluding the garage, is separated from the side boundary with the appeal site by a gap of some 5m, according to the plans. The Council's officers report states that although there are windows in the side elevation of no 54, given the gap and that the proposed first floor window would be obscure glazed, there are no concerns regarding outlook and for the same reasons, I would agree in relation to the windows at no 54.
14. The Council's concerns relate to the dominant, overbearing nature of the proposal in terms of an increased sense of enclosure by reason of the two storey side extension together with the front and rear extensions.
15. Whilst there appears to be an area of external space at no 54 adjacent to the side boundary, its main patio appears to be adjacent to the rear elevation of the dwelling. Given the distance of that from the proposed extensions, they would not be unduly overbearing or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure likely to significantly harm the living conditions of those occupiers. In this regard, therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the Council's policies.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and notwithstanding my findings in regard to living conditions, I conclude that the proposed front and side extensions would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. They are therefore contrary to the development plan. There are no material considerations that would outweigh my findings and the appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector